

SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

104th Congress
1st Session

Vote No. 432

September 15, 1995, 11:04 a.m.
Page S-13636 Temp. Record

WELFARE REFORM BILL/Limits on Food Stamp Reform

SUBJECT: Family Self-Sufficiency Act of 1995 . . . H.R. 4. Kohl amendment No. 2550 to the Dole modified perfecting amendment No. 2280 to the committee substitute amendment.

ACTION: AMENDMENT REJECTED, 47-53

SYNOPSIS: As reported with a committee substitute amendment, H.R. 4, the Family Self-Sufficiency Act of 1995, will overhaul 6 of the Nation's 10 largest welfare programs.

The Dole modified perfecting amendment would strike the provisions of the committee substitute amendment and insert in lieu thereof substitute provisions, entitled "The Work Opportunity Act of 1995."

The Kohl amendment would deny States the right to use the optional Food Stamp block grant program (as contained in the Dole amendment) to provide food stamp benefits to children, the elderly, or the disabled.

Those favoring the amendment contended:

When Americans complain about welfare, they generally talk about able-bodied adults who freeload at the public trough. They do not talk about children, the elderly, or the disabled. No one, for example, ever suggests that these populations should be forced to work for their food stamps. Other parts of the Food Stamp Program may benefit from reform, but for these three groups the program works. Nevertheless, the Dole amendment would include food stamps for the elderly, the disabled, and children in its optional block grant reform proposal. It makes no sense to propose reforming the parts of a program that work well. Accordingly, we have proposed the Kohl amendment to exempt children, the elderly, and the disabled from the Dole amendment's reform proposal. We urge our colleagues to vote in favor of the amendment.

Those opposing the amendment contended:

(See other side)

YEAS (47)			NAYS (53)			NOT VOTING (0)	
Republicans (2 or 4%)	Democrats (45 or 98%)		Republicans (52 or 96%)	Democrats (1 or 2%)		Republicans (0)	Democrats (0)
Cohen	Akaka	Hollings	Abraham	Hutchison	Moynihan		
Jeffords	Baucus	Inouye	Ashcroft	Inhofe			
	Biden	Johnston	Bennett	Kassebaum			
	Bingaman	Kennedy	Bond	Kempthorne			
	Boxer	Kerrey	Brown	Kyl			
	Bradley	Kerry	Burns	Lott			
	Breaux	Kohl	Campbell	Lugar			
	Bryan	Lautenberg	Chafee	Mack			
	Bumpers	Leahy	Coats	McCain			
	Byrd	Levin	Cochran	McConnell			
	Conrad	Lieberman	Coverdell	Murkowski			
	Daschle	Mikulski	Craig	Nickles			
	Dodd	Moseley-Braun	D'Amato	Packwood			
	Dorgan	Murray	DeWine	Pressler			
	Exon	Nunn	Dole	Roth			
	Feingold	Pell	Domenici	Santorum			
	Feinstein	Pryor	Faircloth	Shelby			
	Ford	Reid	Frist	Simpson			
	Glenn	Robb	Gorton	Smith			
	Graham	Rockefeller	Gramm	Snowe			
	Harkin	Sarbanes	Grams	Specter			
	Heflin	Simon	Grassley	Stevens			
		Wellstone	Gregg	Thomas			
			Hatch	Thompson			
			Hatfield	Thurmond			
			Helms	Warner			

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

- 1—Official Business
- 2—Necessarily Absent
- 3—Illness
- 4—Other

SYMBOLS:

- AY—Announced Yea
- AN—Announced Nay
- PY—Paired Yea
- PN—Paired Nay

We oppose this amendment for two reasons. First, it would create a costly, administrative nightmare. States would need two complete administrative systems. They would need to decide who within a family fell under the exemptions, and who did not, and then follow separate procedures in giving benefits. Our second reason for opposing it is that it would result in \$1.4 billion in increased spending over the next 7 years. This increased spending would not be due to increased benefits--it would be due to the Kohl amendment's refusal to allow States to innovate and come up with better ways of providing benefits at lower costs. If we were to agree to the Kohl amendment, we would then have to cut \$1.4 billion from other programs in order to meet the Finance Committee's reconciliation target. Our colleague from Wisconsin, of course, is aware of this fact, yet he failed to propose any offsets in his amendment. If our colleagues favor placing costly administrative burdens on the States, and if they favor fiscally irresponsible proposals, they should vote in favor of the Kohl amendment. We favor neither, and accordingly will vote to reject it.